

Dear Judge Orenstein:

For the record, the Plaintiff's understanding regarding the stipulations was confirmed in 94 when he agreed to the settlement.

Moreover, Plaintiff never request to reopen this case or, the Atkinson v. Geraci, docket No 98 CV 1609.

Plaintiff's argument concerns an interference and infringement upon his right to seek further redress for his petition for writ of habeas corpus under case docket No. 00 CV 3573. And that

None of these factors concern anyone  
but the petitioner-plaintiff and the original  
parties reference to matters of County of Suffolk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANTHONY E. ATKINSON,

Plaintiff,

-against-

JOHN BROESLER,

Defendant.

ORDER  
93-CV-1346 (B.M.)  
RECEIVED IN  
CHAMBERS OF  
MAGISTRATE ORENSTEIN  
JUL 13 2007

The undersigned magistrate judge is in receipt of a letter dated April 19, 2007

("4/19/07 Letter"), from plaintiff Anthony Atkinson, proceeding *pro se* ("plaintiff"). In that letter, plaintiff complains about his criminal prosecution that was the subject of an unsuccessful

habeas petition in Atkinson v. Portuando, 00-CV-3573 (JS), and his subsequent civil rights action in Atkinson v. Garaci, 98 CV 1609 (JS), both of which were assigned to judges other

than those in the instant case. Plaintiff contends that the Court in the instant action may entertain his current application because some unspecified violation of a stipulation

(presumably the stipulation of discontinuance) in the instant case provides the basis for jurisdiction. Plaintiff suggests that unidentified individuals may be "impeding [his]

communication" to the Court. See 4/19/07 Letter. Communications in general.

The stipulation of discontinuance in this case was filed in June 1994, at which time the case was closed. Plaintiff specifies no basis for reopening the case after 13 years. Moreover, it appears that by filing under the caption in this case, plaintiff is simply attempting to circumvent the order of Judge Joanna Seybert in Atkinson v. Geraci, 98 CV 1609, directing plaintiff to cease filing papers in the cases assigned to her, all of which have long since closed.

See 2/25/04 Order in 98 CV 1609 (JS); see also Calendar Entries for 12/9/05, 3/17/06, 6/16/06, 8/18/06, and 1/12/07 in 98 CV 1609 (JS).

Plaintiff's request for judicial intervention in the instant action is denied.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
June 29, 2007

*Roanne L. Mann*  
ROANNE L. MANN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In addition, when Plaintiff filed a grievance at the Second and Eleventh Committee Chief Counsel Diana Maxfield Kearse indicated that matters pertained to the 16th Judicial District.

And that she would refer Plaintiff's complaint to Chief Counsel Robert P. Guido at the Syosset office.

Yet, there are other individuals in possession of these grievances and infringing upon the issues and matters that don't concern them. Nor did Plaintiff authorize anyone to represent any of his legal affairs and can speak for him self on behalf of his own legal affairs. And that infringement is unlawful and illegal.

Signed *Anthony Atkinson*  
Anthony Atkinson